arXiv:1108.4886v4 [math.OC] 6 Nov 2011

Identifying the Free Boundary of a Stochastic, Irreversible Investment Problem via the Bank-El Karoui Representation Theorem[*]

Maria B. Chiarolla[†] Giorgio Ferrari[‡]

October 23, 2011

Abstract. We study a stochastic, continuous time model on a finite horizon for a firm that produces a single good. We model the production capacity as an Ito diffusion controlled by a nondecreasing process representing the cumulative investment. The firm aims to maximize its expected total net profit by choosing the optimal investment process. That is a singular stochastic control problem.

We derive some first order conditions for optimality and we characterize the optimal solution in terms of the *base capacity* process $l^*(t)$, i.e. the unique solution of a Representation Problem in the spirit of Bank and El Karoui [3].

Under Markovian assumptions we show that the base capacity is in fact deterministic and coincides with the free boundary $\hat{y}(t)$ of the optimal stopping problem naturally associated to the original singular control problem. This result allows us to obtain the continuity of the free boundary $\hat{y}(t)$ in the case of a Cobb-Douglas production function and of constant coefficients in the controlled capacity process.

Key words: irreversible investment, singular stochastic control, optimal stopping, free boundary, Bank and El Karoui's Representation Theorem, base capacity.

MSC2010 subsject classification: 91B70, 93E20, 60G40, 60H25.

JEL classification: C02, E22, D92, G31.

1 Introduction

We study a continuous time, singular stochastic investment problem on a finite horizon T for a firm that produces a single good. The setting is as in Chiarolla and Haussmann [7] but without leisure, wages and scrap value. The capacity process is a diffusion controlled by a nondecreasing

---

[*] These results extend a portion of the second author Ph.D. dissertation [10] under the supervision of the first author.

[†] Dipartimento di Metodi e Modelli per l'Economia, il Territorio e la Finanza, Università di Roma 'La Sapienza', via del Castro Laurenziano 9, 00161 Roma, Italy; `maria.chiarolla@uniroma1.it`

[‡] Corresponding author. Dipartimento di Metodi e Modelli per l'Economia, il Territorio e la Finanza, Università di Roma 'La Sapienza', via del Castro Laurenziano 9, 00161 Roma, Italy; `giorgio.ferrari@uniroma1.it`

process $\nu(t)$ representing the cumulative investment, i.e.

$$\begin{cases} dC^{y,\nu}(t) = C^{y,\nu}(t)[-\mu_C(t)dt + \sigma_C(t)dW(t)] + f_C(t)d\nu(t), & t \in [0,T), \\ C^{y,\nu}(0) = y > 0. \end{cases}$$

The optimal investment problem is

$$\sup_{\nu} \mathbb{E}\bigg\{ \int_0^T e^{-\int_0^t \mu_F(s)ds} R(C^{y,\nu}(t))dt - \int_{[0,T)} e^{-\int_0^t \mu_F(s)ds} d\nu(t) \bigg\}.$$

In [7] the Authors proved the existence of the optimal investment process $\hat{\nu}$. As expected, the optimal time to invest τ^* was the solution of the associated optimal stopping problem. In particular, under constant coefficients and a Cobb-Douglas production function, they obtained a variational formulation for the optimal stopping problem, i.e. a free boundary problem. In order to characterize the moving boundary $\hat{y}(t)$ through an integral equation, the Authors proved the left-continuity of $\hat{y}(t)$ and assumed its right-continuity (cf. [7], Assumption-[Cfb]) since continuity of the free boundary was needed to prove the smooth fit property.

In this paper, rather than trying to generalize the variational approach to the case of time-dependent coefficients, we introduce a new approach based on a stochastic generalization of the Kuhn-Tucker conditions and we identify the free boundary by exploiting the Bank-El Karoui Representation Theorem (cf. [3]). As a subproduct, in the case of constant coefficients and of a Cobb-Douglas production function, we obtain the right-continuity of the free boundary, whereas the variational approach did not lead to it in [7].

The Bank-El Karoui Representation Theorem allows to write an optional process $X = \{X(t), t \in [0,T]\}$ as an optional projection of the form

$$X(t) = \mathbb{E}\bigg\{ \int_t^T f\Big(s, \sup_{t\le v\le s} \xi(v)\Big)\, ds \,\Big|\mathcal{F}_t\bigg\}, \qquad t \in [0,T], \tag{1.1}$$

where $f = f(t,\xi)$ is a prescribed function, strictly decreasing in ξ, and $\{\xi(t), t \in [0,T]\}$ is a progressively measurable process to be found. It was shown in [3] that the representation problem (1.1) is closely linked to the solution of stochastic optimization problems as ontinuous time dynamic allocation problems with a limited amount of effort to spend on a fixed number of projects (e.g., cf. [9]), or the optimal consumption choice problem in a general semimartingale setting with Hindy-Huang-Kreps utility functional (cf. [2]).

It turns out that the representation problem (1.1) allows to handle problems in a framework not necessarily Markovian, as optimal control problems with a time-dependent, stochastic fuel constraint (cf. [4]), or irreversible investment problems (cf. [17]) with deterministic capacity and with profit rate influenced by a stochastic parameter process, not necessarily a diffusion. In [17] *invest just enough to keep the production capacity above a certain lower bound* ('the base capacity') was shown to be the optimal investment strategy. Clearly such policy acts like the optimal control of singular stochastic control problems as the original Monotone Follower Problem (e.g., cf. [13] and [14]) or, more generally, irreversible investment problems (cf. [1] and [7]). Therefore the 'base capacity' and the free boundary arising in singular stochastic control problems must be linked. Here we aim to prove such link by identifying the 'base capacity' $l^*(t)$ of our irreversible investment problem.

We start by proving some first order conditions for optimality. Then we obtain $l^*(t)$ as the unique solution of a representation problem à la Bank and El Karoui [3]. Hence we characterize the optimal solution of the investment problem in terms of $l^*(t)$ by the first order conditions for optimality. In particular, we prove that the 'base capacity' $l^*(t)$ is deterministic and coincides with the free boundary $\hat{y}(t)$ of the original irreversible investment problem when the coefficients of the controlled diffusion and the manager's discount factor are deterministic. It turns out that the representation problem for $l^*(t)$ provides an integral equation for the free boundary which might be solved numerically by backward induction. If the coefficients and the discount factor are constant and the production function is of the Cobb-Douglas type, we obtain the right-continuity of the free boundary $\hat{y}(t)$ by means of the identification with $l^*(t)$. Hence we conclude that $\hat{y}(t)$ is continuous.

Notice that when $T = +\infty$ we are able to find the explicit form of the free boundary which we show to coincide with that obtained in [16] by H. Pham via a viscosity solution approach.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we introduce the optimal investment problem, whereas in Section 3 we derive the first order conditions for optimality. In Section 4 we find the optimal production capacity. In Section 5, under Markovian assumptions, we show that $l^*(t)$ is deterministic and coincides with $\hat{y}(t)$. Section 6 is devoted to the analysis of the Cobb-Douglas case with infinite time horizon. In the Appendix we recall the variational approach of Chiarolla and Haussmann [7] and we generalize some of their results to the case of deterministic, time-dependent coefficients. Such results are needed in Section 5.

2 The Firm's Investment Problem

The setting is as in Chiarolla and Haussmann [7] but without leisure, wages and scrap value. We briefly recall their notation. An economy with finite horizon T and productive sector represented by a firm is considered on a complete probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ with filtration $\{\mathcal{F}_t, t \in [0,T]\}$. Such filtration is the usual augmentation of the filtration generated by an exogeneous Brownian motion $\{W(t), t \in [0,T]\}$ and augmented by $\mathbb{P}$-null sets. The firm produces at rate $R(C)$ when its capacity is C. The cumulative, irreversible investment is denoted by $\nu(t)$. It is an a.s. finite, left-continuous with right-limits, nondecreasing, and adapted process. The irreversibility of investment is expressed by the nondecreasing nature of ν. The production capacity $C^{y,\nu}$ associated to the investment strategy ν satisfies

$$\begin{cases} dC^{y,\nu}(t) = C^{y,\nu}(t)[-\mu_C(t)dt + \sigma_C(t)dW(t)] + f_C(t)d\nu(t), \;\; t \in [0,T), \\ \\ C^{y,\nu}(0) = y > 0, \end{cases} \tag{2.1}$$

where μ_C, σ_C and f_C are given measurable, uniformly bounded in (ω, t) adapted processes. Moreover f_C is continuous with $0 < k_f \leq f_C(t) \leq \kappa_f$ and $\mu_C \geq 0$. Here f_C is a conversion factor since any unit of investment is converted into f_C units of production capacity.

By setting

$$C^0(t) := C^{1,0}(t), \qquad \overline{\nu}(t) := \int_{[0,t)} \frac{f_C(s)}{C^0(s)} d\nu(s), \tag{2.2}$$

then we may write

$$C^0(t) = e^{-\int_0^t \mu_C(s)ds} \mathcal{M}_0(t), \tag{2.3}$$

where the exponential martingale

$$\mathcal{M}_s(t) := e^{-\int_s^t \frac{1}{2}\sigma_C^2(u)du + \int_s^t \sigma_C(u)dW(u)}, \quad t \in [s,T], \tag{2.4}$$

is defined for $s \in [0,T]$. Without investment, C^0 represents the decay of a unit of initial capital and we have

$$C^{y,\nu}(t) = C^0(t)[y + \overline{\nu}(t)]. \tag{2.5}$$

The production function of the firm is a nonnegative, measurable function $R(C)$. We make the following

Assumption 2.1.

1. *the mapping $C \to R(C)$ is strictly increasing and strictly concave with continuous derivative $R_c(C) := \frac{\partial}{\partial C}R(C)$ satisfying the Inada conditions*

$$\lim_{C\to 0} R_c(C) = \infty, \qquad \lim_{C\to\infty} R_c(C) = 0.$$

2. $\forall \eta > 0 : \quad \sup_{C\geq 0}\{R(C) - \eta C\} < \infty.$

Our Assumption 2.1 is not as general as the Assumption in [7] but it is needed to apply the Bank-El Karoui Representation Theorem [3]. Assumption 2.1, part 2 is satisfied by any production function which grows at infinity less than linearly as, for example, the Cobb-Douglas one, i.e. $R(C) = C^\alpha/\alpha$ with $\alpha \in (0,1)$.

Each investment plan $\nu \in \mathcal{S}_0$ leads to the expected total profit net of investment

$$\mathcal{J}_{0,y}(\nu) = \mathbb{E}\left\{ \int_0^T e^{-\int_0^t \mu_F(s)ds} R(C^{y,\nu}(t))dt - \int_{[0,T)} e^{-\int_0^t \mu_F(s)ds} d\nu(t) \right\} \tag{2.6}$$

where

$$\mathcal{S}_0 \quad := \quad \{\nu : \Omega \times [0,T] \to \mathbb{R}_+, \text{ nondecreasing, left-continuous, adapted s.t. } \nu(0) = 0, \ \mathbb{P}-\text{a.s.}\}$$

is the convex set of irreversible investment processes. Here μ_F is the firm's manager discount factor; it is a nonnegative, measurable, uniformly bounded in (ω, t) adapted process. Of course $\mathcal{S}_0 \neq \emptyset$ because $\nu(t) = 0$ for all $t \in [0,T]$ belongs to $\mathcal{S}_0$.

The firm's problem is

$$V(0,y) := \sup_{\nu\in\mathcal{S}_0} \mathcal{J}_{0,y}(\nu). \tag{2.7}$$

V is finite thanks to Assumption 2.1, part 2 (cf. [7], Proposition 2.1). Moreover, the concavity of R and the affine nature of $C^{y,\nu}$ in ν imply that $\mathcal{J}_{0,y}(\nu)$ is strictly concave on $\mathcal{S}_0$. Hence if a solution $\hat{\nu}$ of (2.7) exists, it is unique. The existence of the solution has been proved in [7], Theorem 3.1. We provide a new characterization of it in Theorem 4.4.

3 First Order Conditions for Optimality

As in [2] and [8], we aim to characterize the optimal solution of (2.7) by some first order conditions for optimality.

Let $\mathcal{T}$ denote the set of all stopping times with value in $[0,T]$, $\mathbb{P}$-a.s. Note that the strict concave functional $\mathcal{J}_{0,y}(\nu)$ admits the supergradient

$$\begin{aligned}\nabla_\nu \mathcal{J}_{0,y}(\nu)(\tau) \quad := \quad & \mathbb{E}\bigg\{ \int_\tau^T e^{-\int_0^s \mu_F(u)du} C^0(s) \frac{f_C(\tau)}{C^0(\tau)} \, R_c(C^{y,\nu}(s))\, ds \,\bigg|\, \mathcal{F}_\tau \bigg\} \\ & - e^{-\int_0^\tau \mu_F(u)du} \, \mathbb{1}_{\{\tau<T\}},\end{aligned} \tag{3.1}$$

for $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$.

Remark 3.1. *The quantity $\nabla_\nu \mathcal{J}_{0,y}(\nu)(t)$ may be interpreted as the marginal expected future profit resulting from an additional infinitesimal investment at time t. Mathematically, $\nabla_\nu \mathcal{J}_{0,y}(\nu)$ can be viewed as the Riesz representation of the profit's gradient at ν. More precisely, we may define $\nabla_\nu \mathcal{J}_{0,y}(\nu)$ as the optional projection of the progressively measurable process*

$$\phi(\omega,t) := \int_t^T e^{-\int_0^s \mu_F(\omega,u)du} C^0(\omega,s) \frac{f_C(\omega,t)}{C^0(\omega,t)} \, R_c(C^{y,\nu}(\omega,s))\, ds - e^{-\int_0^t \mu_F(\omega,u)du} \mathbb{1}_{\{t<T\}}, \tag{3.2}$$

for $\omega \in \Omega$, $t \in [0,T]$. Hence $\nabla_\nu \mathcal{J}_{0,y}(\nu)$ is uniquely determined up to $\mathbb{P}$-indistinguishability and it holds

$$\mathbb{E}\bigg\{ \int_{[0,T)} \nabla_\nu \mathcal{J}_{0,y}(\nu)(t) d\nu(t) \bigg\} = \mathbb{E}\bigg\{ \int_{[0,T)} \phi(t) d\nu(t) \bigg\} \tag{3.3}$$

for all $\nu \in \mathcal{S}_0$ (cf. Theorem 1.33 in [11]).

We shall prove that

Theorem 3.2. *Given problem (2.7), the following first-order conditions*

$$\nabla_\nu \mathcal{J}_{0,y}(\hat{\nu})(\tau) \le 0, \quad \forall \tau \in \mathcal{T}, \;\; \mathbb{P}-a.s., \tag{3.4}$$

$$\mathbb{E}\bigg\{ \int_{[0,T)} \nabla_\nu \mathcal{J}_{0,y}(\hat{\nu})(\tau) \, d\hat{\nu}(\tau) \bigg\} = 0, \tag{3.5}$$

are sufficient for the optimality of $\hat{\nu}(t)$.

Conversely, if $\mathcal{J}_{0,y}(\nu) \ge 0$ for all $\nu \in \mathcal{S}_0$ and $\overline{\nu}^y(T) := \int_{[0,T)} \frac{f_C(s)}{C_0(s)} d\hat{\nu}(s)$ is $\mathbb{P}$-integrable, then (3.4) and (3.5) are also necessary for optimality.

The proof of Theorem 3.2 relies on the following Lemma. The idea is to use arguments similar to those in the proof of the finite dimensional Kuhn-Tucker Theorem. First of all, notice that the supergradient (3.1) evaluated at the optimal investment plan cannot be positive. In fact there cannot exist a stopping time $\overline{\tau} \in \mathcal{T}$ such that $\nabla_\nu \mathcal{J}_{0,y}(\hat{\nu})(\overline{\tau}) > 0$, since the continuity of R_c and the linearity of the investment cost imply that a sufficiently small extra investment at $\overline{\tau}$ would be profitable, and hence $\hat{\nu}$ would not be optimal. Therefore $\nabla_\nu \mathcal{J}_{0,y}(\hat{\nu})(\tau) \le 0$ for all $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$.

In the next Lemma we show that if $\mathcal{J}_{0,y}(\nu) \ge 0$ for all $\nu \in \mathcal{S}_0$ and $\mathbb{E}\{\overline{\nu}^y(T)\} < +\infty$, then the optimal policy $\hat{\nu}$ solves the problem linearized near $\hat{\nu}$. The solutions of the linear problem are characterized by a *flat-off condition*.

Lemma 3.3. *Let $\hat{\nu}$ be optimal for problem (2.7) and let $\hat{\phi}$ be the progressively measurable process given by (3.2) and corresponding to $\nabla_\nu \mathcal{J}_{0,y}(\hat{\nu})$. If $\mathcal{J}_{0,y}(\nu) \geq 0$ for all $\nu \in \mathcal{S}_0$ and $\mathbb{E}\{\overline{\nu}^y(T)\} < +\infty$, then $\hat{\nu}$ solves the linear problem*

$$\sup_{\nu \in \mathcal{S}_0} \mathbb{E}\Big\{ \int_{[0,T)} \hat{\phi}(s) d\nu(s) \Big\}. \tag{3.6}$$

Proof. Let $\nu \in \mathcal{S}_0$. We set $\nu^\epsilon(t) = \epsilon\nu(t) + (1-\epsilon)\hat{\nu}(t)$, for $\epsilon \in (0,1)$, and define ϕ^ϵ to be the progressively measurable process given by (3.2) and corresponding to $\nabla_\nu \mathcal{J}_{0,y}(\nu^\epsilon)$. Of course $\lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \nu^\epsilon(t) = \hat{\nu}(t)$ for all $t \leq T$, $\mathbb{P}$-a.s., as well as $\lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \phi^\epsilon(t) = \hat{\phi}(t)$ by continuity of R_c. By optimality of $\hat{\nu}$ and concavity of R we have

$$\begin{aligned}
0 \;\geq\; & \frac{\mathcal{J}_{0,y}(\nu^\epsilon) - \mathcal{J}_{0,y}(\hat{\nu})}{\epsilon} \\
=\; & \frac{1}{\epsilon}\mathbb{E}\Big\{ \int_0^T e^{-\int_0^t \mu_F(u)du} \left(R(C^{y,\nu^\epsilon}(t)) - R(C^{y,\hat{\nu}}(t))\right)dt \Big\} \\
& \quad -\frac{1}{\epsilon}\mathbb{E}\Big\{ \int_{[0,T)} e^{-\int_0^t \mu_F(u)du} \left(d\nu^\epsilon(t) - d\hat{\nu}(t)\right) \Big\} \\
\geq\; & \frac{1}{\epsilon}\mathbb{E}\Big\{ \int_0^T e^{-\int_0^t \mu_F(u)du} R_c(C^{y,\nu^\epsilon}(t))(C^{y,\nu^\epsilon}(t) - C^{y,\hat{\nu}}(t)) \Big\} dt \\
& \quad -\mathbb{E}\Big\{ \int_{[0,T)} e^{-\int_0^t \mu_F(u)du} \left(d\nu(t) - d\hat{\nu}(t)\right) \Big\} \qquad\qquad (3.7) \\
=\; & \mathbb{E}\Big\{ \int_0^T e^{-\int_0^t \mu_F(u)du} R_c(C^{y,\nu^\epsilon}(t)) \Big[\int_{[0,t)} C^0(t) \frac{f_C(u)}{C^0(u)} \left(d\nu(u) - d\hat{\nu}(u)\right) \Big] \Big\} dt \\
& \quad -\mathbb{E}\Big\{ \int_{[0,T)} e^{-\int_0^t \mu_F(u)du} \left(d\nu(t) - d\hat{\nu}(t)\right) \Big\} \\
=\; & \mathbb{E}\Big\{ \int_{[0,T)} \Big[\int_t^T e^{-\int_0^s \mu_F(u)du} R_c(C^{y,\nu^\epsilon}(s)) C^0(s) \frac{f_C(t)}{C^0(t)} ds - e^{-\int_0^t \mu_F(u)du} \Big] \left(d\nu(t) - d\hat{\nu}(t)\right) \Big\} \\
=\; & \mathbb{E}\Big\{ \int_{[0,T)} \phi^\epsilon(t) \left(d\nu(t) - d\hat{\nu}(t)\right) \Big\}
\end{aligned}$$

where in the third equality we have used Fubini's Theorem.

We would like to prove that

$$\mathbb{E}\Big\{ \int_{[0,T)} \hat{\phi}(t) \left(d\nu(t) - d\hat{\nu}(t)\right) \Big\} \leq 0.$$

Consider

$$\begin{aligned}
I^\epsilon \;:=\; & \int_{[0,T)} \phi^\epsilon(t) \left(d\nu(t) - d\hat{\nu}(t)\right) \\
=\; & \int_0^T e^{-\int_0^t \mu_F(u)du} R_c(C^{y,\nu^\epsilon}(t)) \Big[\int_{[0,t)} C^0(t) \frac{f_C(s)}{C^0(s)} \left(d\nu(s) - d\hat{\nu}(s)\right) \Big] dt
\end{aligned}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& - \int_{[0,T)} e^{-\int_0^t \mu_F(u)du}\,(d\nu(t) - d\hat{\nu}(t)) \qquad (3.8)\\
= & \int_0^T e^{-\int_0^t \mu_F(u)du}\,R_c(C^{y,\nu^\epsilon}(t))(C^{y,\nu}(t) - C^{y,\hat{\nu}}(t))dt\\
& - \int_{[0,T)} e^{-\int_0^t \mu_F(u)du}\,(d\nu(t) - d\hat{\nu}(t))\,,
\end{aligned}
$$

where in the first equality we have used Fubini's Theorem. Notice that

$$
C^{y,\nu^\epsilon}(t) = \epsilon C^{y,\nu}(t) + (1-\epsilon)C^{y,\hat{\nu}}(t)
\begin{cases}
\leq C^{y,\nu}(t) & \text{on} \quad \{C^{y,\nu}(t) - C^{y,\hat{\nu}}(t) \geq 0\},\\
\\
> C^{y,\nu}(t) & \text{on} \quad \{C^{y,\nu}(t) - C^{y,\hat{\nu}}(t) < 0\}.
\end{cases}
\tag{3.9}
$$

Since the production function is concave, then for $\epsilon \in (0,1)$ the decreasing property of R_c and (3.9) give

$$
\begin{aligned}
I^\epsilon &= \int_{[0,T)} \phi^\epsilon(t)(d\nu(t) - d\hat{\nu}(t))\\
&\geq \int_0^T e^{-\int_0^t \mu_F(u)du} R_c(C^{y,\nu}(t))(C^{y,\nu}(t) - C^{y,\hat{\nu}}(t))\,\mathbb{1}_{\{C^{y,\nu}(t) \geq C^{y,\hat{\nu}}(t)\}}dt\\
&\quad + \int_0^T e^{-\int_0^t \mu_F(u)du} R_c(C^{y,\nu}(t))(C^{y,\nu}(t) - C^{y,\hat{\nu}}(t))\,\mathbb{1}_{\{C^{y,\nu}(t) < C^{y,\hat{\nu}}(t)\}}dt\\
&\quad - \int_{[0,T)} e^{-\int_0^t \mu_F(u)du}(d\nu(t) - d\hat{\nu}(t)) \qquad (3.10)\\
&= \int_0^T e^{-\int_0^t \mu_F(u)du} R_c(C^{y,\nu}(t))(C^{y,\nu}(t) - C^{y,\hat{\nu}}(t))dt\\
&\quad - \int_{[0,T)} e^{-\int_0^t \mu_F(u)du}(d\nu(t) - d\hat{\nu}(t))\\
&= \int_{[0,T)} \nabla_\nu \mathcal{J}_{0,y}(\nu)(t)(d\nu(t) - d\hat{\nu}(t)) =: G(\omega).
\end{aligned}
$$

If $\mathbb{E}\left\{|G(\omega)|\right\} < +\infty$, we may apply Fatou's Lemma to $\lim_{\epsilon\to 0}\mathbb{E}\left\{I^\epsilon(\omega)\right\}$ and obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}\Big\{ \int_{[0,T)} \hat{\phi}(s)(d\nu(s) - d\hat{\nu}(s))\Big\}\\
& \leq \liminf_{\epsilon\to 0} \mathbb{E}\Big\{ \int_{[0,T)} \phi^\epsilon(s)(d\nu(s) - d\hat{\nu}(s))\Big\} \leq 0
\end{aligned}
\tag{3.11}
$$

by (3.7).

It remains to show that $\mathbb{E}\left\{|G(\omega)|\right\} < +\infty$. The growth assumption on R (cf. Assumption 2.1, part 2) implies that for every $\eta > 0$ there exists κ_η such that $R(C) \leq \kappa_\eta + \eta C$. As in [7] we define $\overline{\nu}^y(t) := \int_{[0,t)} \frac{f_C(s)}{C^0(s)} d\hat{\nu}(s)$. By concavity of R we have

$$\begin{aligned}
|G(\omega)| \;\leq\;& \int_0^T e^{-\int_0^t \mu_F(u)du}\, \frac{R\left(C^{y,\nu}(t)\right)}{C^{y,\nu}(t)} \left|C^{y,\nu}(t) - C^{y,\hat{\nu}}(t)\right| dt \\
&+ \int_{[0,T)} e^{-\int_0^t \mu_F(u)du}\, |d\nu(t) - d\hat{\nu}(t)| \\
\leq\;& \int_0^T e^{-\int_0^t \mu_F(u)du}\, \frac{\kappa_\eta + \eta C^{y,\nu}(t)}{C^{y,\nu}(t)} \left|C^{y,\nu}(t) - C^{y,\hat{\nu}}(t)\right| dt \\
&+ \int_{[0,T)} e^{-\int_0^t \mu_F(u)du}\, (d\nu(t) + d\hat{\nu}(t)) \\
\leq\;& \kappa_\eta T + \int_0^T e^{-\int_0^t \mu_F(u)du}\, \kappa_\eta \left(\frac{y + \overline{\nu}^y(t)}{y}\right) dt + \\
&+ \eta \int_0^T e^{-\int_0^t \mu_F(u)du} C^0(t) \left(\overline{\nu}(t) + \overline{\nu}^y(t)\right) dt \\
&+ \int_{[0,T)} e^{-\int_0^t \mu_F(u)du}\, (d\nu(t) + d\hat{\nu}(t)) \\
\leq\;& 2\kappa_\eta T + \frac{\kappa_\eta}{y} \int_0^T e^{-\int_0^t \mu_F(u)du}\, \overline{\nu}^y(t) dt + \eta \int_0^T e^{-\int_0^t \mu_F(u)du}\, C^0(t)(\overline{\nu}(t) + \overline{\nu}^y(t)) dt \\
&+ \int_{[0,T)} e^{-\int_0^t \mu_F(u)du}\, (d\nu(t) + d\hat{\nu}(t)).
\end{aligned} \tag{3.12}$$

If $\mathcal{J}_{0,y}(\nu) \geq 0$, then [7], Proposition 2.1 part (b), implies $\mathbb{E}\{\int_{[0,T)} e^{-\int_0^t \mu_F(u)du}\, d\nu(t)\} < +\infty$ for all $\nu \in \mathcal{S}_0$. Thus we have only to show that

$$\mathbb{E}\left\{\int_0^T e^{-\int_0^t \mu_F(u)du}\, \overline{\nu}^y(t) dt\right\} < \infty \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{E}\left\{\int_0^T e^{-\int_0^t \mu_F(u)du}\, C^0(t)(\overline{\nu}(t) + \overline{\nu}^y(t)) dt\right\} < +\infty.$$

Clearly, if $\overline{\nu}^y(T)$ is $\mathbb{P}$-integrable then $\mathbb{E}\left\{\int_0^T e^{-\int_0^t \mu_F(u)du} \overline{\nu}^y(t) dt\right\} < +\infty$.

Recall that $C^0(t) = e^{-\int_0^t \mu_C(u)du} \mathcal{M}_0(t)$ and apply Fubini's Theorem to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}\left\{\int_0^T e^{-\int_0^t \mu_F(u)du}\, C^0(t)\overline{\nu}(t) dt\right\} &= \mathbb{E}\left\{\int_{[0,T)} f_C(s)\, \frac{d\nu(s)}{C^0(s)} \int_s^T e^{-\int_0^t \mu_F(u)du}\, C^0(t) dt\right\} \\
&\leq \mathbb{E}\left\{\int_{[0,T)} e^{\int_0^s \mu_C(u)} \frac{f_C(s)}{\mathcal{M}_0(s)} d\nu(s)\, \mathbb{E}\left\{\int_s^T e^{-\int_0^t (\mu_C(u) + \mu_F(u))du} \mathcal{M}_0(t)\, dt\, |\mathcal{F}_s\right\}\right\} \\
&\leq \text{const}\, \mathbb{E}\{\nu(T)\},
\end{aligned} \tag{3.13}$$

since f_C, μ_C and μ_F are uniformly bounded in (t, ω). Again by [7], Proposition 2.1 part (b), if $\mathcal{J}_{0,y}(\nu) \geq 0$ then $\mathbb{E}\{\nu(T)\} < \infty$ for all $\nu \in \mathcal{S}_0$. Hence $\mathbb{E}\left\{\int_0^T e^{-\int_0^t \mu_F(u)du}\, C^0(t)\, \overline{\nu}(t) dt\right\} < +\infty$ and similarly for $\mathbb{E}\left\{\int_0^T e^{-\int_0^t \mu_F(u)du}\, C^0(t)\, \overline{\nu}^y(t) dt\right\}$. It means that $G(\omega)$ is $\mathbb{P}$-integrable and this concludes the proof. □

Notice that for every nonpositive, optional, and adapted process $f(t)$, the linear optimization problem

$$\sup_{\nu\in\mathcal{S}_0} \mathbb{E}\Big\{ \int_{[0,T)} f(s)d\nu(s)\Big\} \tag{3.14}$$

has value zero since $\nu \in \mathcal{S}_0$ has nondecreasing paths.

Proof of Theorem 3.2. Let $\hat{\nu}$ satisfy the first-order conditions (3.4) and (3.5) and let $\nu \in \mathcal{S}_0$. Then it follows from (2.5) that

$$C^{y,\hat{\nu}}(t) - C^{y,\nu}(t) = \int_{[0,t)} C^0(t)\frac{f_C(s)}{C^0(s)}(d\hat{\nu}(s) - d\nu(s)).$$

Hence the strict concavity of R implies

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathcal{J}_{0,y}(\hat{\nu}) - \mathcal{J}_{0,y}(\nu)\\
&= \mathbb{E}\Big\{ \int_0^T e^{-\int_0^t \mu_F(u)du}(R(C^{y,\hat{\nu}}(t)) - R(C^{y,\nu}(t)))dt - \int_{[0,T)} e^{-\int_0^t \mu_F(u)du}(d\hat{\nu}(t) - d\nu(t))\Big\}\\
&> \mathbb{E}\Big\{ \int_0^T e^{-\int_0^t \mu_F(u)du}\, R_c(C^{y,\hat{\nu}}(t))(C^{y,\hat{\nu}}(t) - C^{y,\nu}(t))dt - \int_{[0,T)} e^{-\int_0^t \mu_F(u)du}(d\hat{\nu}(t) - d\nu(t))\Big\}\\
&= \mathbb{E}\Big\{ \int_0^T e^{-\int_0^t \mu_F(u)du}\, R_c(C^{y,\hat{\nu}}(t)) \int_{[0,t)} C^0(t)\frac{f_C(s)}{C^0(s)}(d\hat{\nu}(s) - d\nu(s))dt\\
&\qquad - \int_{[0,T)} e^{-\int_0^t \mu_F(u)du}(d\hat{\nu}(t) - d\nu(t))\Big\} \qquad (3.15)\\
&= \mathbb{E}\Big\{ \int_{[0,T)} \Big[\int_t^T e^{-\int_0^s \mu_F(u)du}\, R_c(C^{y,\hat{\nu}}(s))\, C^0(s)\frac{f_C(t)}{C^0(t)}ds - e^{-\int_0^t \mu_F(u)du}\Big](d\hat{\nu}(t) - d\nu(t))\Big\}\\
&= \mathbb{E}\Big\{ \int_{[0,T)} \nabla_\nu \mathcal{J}_{0,y}(\hat{\nu})(t)\,(d\hat{\nu}(t) - d\nu(t))\Big\} \geq 0
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used Fubini's theorem in the third equality, and (3.4) and (3.5) in the last one. It follows that $\hat{\nu}$ is optimal for problem (2.7).

On the other hand, that (3.4) and (3.5) are necessary for optimality follows from Lemma 3.3. □

Theorem (3.2) characterizes the optimal investment plan but it might not be useful if one aims to find the explicit solution, since the first order conditions are not always binding.

In what follows we construct the optimal capacity in terms of the '*base capacity*' $(l(t))_{t\in[0,T]}$ (cf. [17]) which represents the capacity level that is optimal for a firm starting at time t without any knowledge of the past capacity, and we show that it is optimal for (2.7) to invest up to the base capacity level if the current capacity level is below it; otherwise no investment is optimal.

4 Finding the Optimal Capacity Process

Recall the Bank-El Karoui Representation Theorem (cf. [3], Theorem 3); that is, given

- an optional process $X = \{X(t), t \in [0,T]\}$ of class (D), lower-semicontinuous in expectation with $X(T) = 0$,
- a nonnegative optional random Borel measure $\mu(\omega, dt)$,
- $f(\omega, t, x) : \Omega \times [0,T] \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ such that $f(\omega, t, \cdot) : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ is continuous in x, strictly decreasing from $+\infty$ to $-\infty$, and the stochastic process $f(\cdot, \cdot, x) : \Omega \times [0,T] \to \mathbb{R}$ is progressively measurable and integrable with respect to $d\mathbb{P} \otimes \mu(\omega, dt)$,

then there exists a unique optional process $\xi = \{\xi(t), t \in [0,T]\}$ such that for all $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$

$$f(t, \sup_{\tau \le u \le t} \xi(u)) \mathbb{1}_{[\tau, T)}(t) \in \mathbf{L}^1 \left(d\mathbb{P} \otimes \mu(\omega, dt) \right)$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}\bigg\{ \int_\tau^T f(s, \sup_{\tau \le u \le s} \xi(u))\, \mu(\omega, ds) \,\Big|\, \mathcal{F}_\tau \bigg\} = X(\tau).$$

Note that ξ may be taken to be upper right-continuous a.s. (cf. [3], Lemma 4.1).

Lemma 4.1. *There exists a unique upper right-continuous process* $\xi^*(t)$ *that solves*

$$\mathbb{E}\bigg\{ \int_\tau^T e^{-\int_0^s \mu_F(u)du} C^0(s)\, R_c\Big(-\frac{C^0(s)}{\sup_{\tau \le u \le s} \xi^*(u)} \Big)\, ds \,\Big|\, \mathcal{F}_\tau \bigg\} = e^{-\int_0^\tau \mu_F(u)du} \frac{C^0(\tau)}{f_C(\tau)} \mathbb{1}_{\{\tau < T\}} \tag{4.1}$$

for all $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$. *Moreover* $\xi^*(t) < 0$ *for all* $t \in [0,T)$ *a.s.*

Proof. We apply the Bank-El Karoui Representation Theorem to

$$X(\omega, t) := e^{-\int_0^t \mu_F(\omega,u)du} \frac{C^0(\omega,t)}{f_C(\omega,t)} \mathbb{1}_{[0,T)}(t), \qquad \mu(\omega, dt) := e^{-\int_0^t \mu_F(\omega,u)du}\, C^0(\omega,t)dt \tag{4.2}$$

and

$$f(\omega, t, x) := \begin{cases} R_c\left(-\frac{C^0(\omega,t)}{x} \right), & \text{for } x < 0, \\ \\ -x\,, & \text{for } x \ge 0. \end{cases} \tag{4.3}$$

Then there exists a unique upper right-continuous process ξ^* such that, for all $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$

$$e^{-\int_0^\tau \mu_F(u)du} \frac{C^0(\tau)}{f_C(\tau)} \mathbb{1}_{\{\tau < T\}} = \mathbb{E}\bigg\{ \int_\tau^T f(s, \sup_{\tau \le u \le s} \xi^*(u))\, \mu(ds) \,\Big|\, \mathcal{F}_\tau \bigg\}. \tag{4.4}$$

It now sufficies to show that $\xi^* < 0$ on $[0,T)$ a.s. Define

$$\sigma := \inf\{t \in [0,T) : \xi^*(t) \ge 0\} \wedge T,$$

then for $\omega \in \{\sigma < T\}$, the upper right-continuity of ξ^* implies $\xi^*(\sigma) \ge 0$ and therefore $\sup_{\sigma \le u \le s} \xi^*(u) \ge 0$ for all $s \in [\sigma, T]$. Therefore, (4.4) with $\tau = \sigma$, i.e.

$$e^{-\int_0^\sigma \mu_F(u)du} \frac{C^0(\sigma)}{f_C(\sigma)} \mathbb{1}_{\{\sigma < T\}} = -\mathbb{E}\bigg\{ \int_\sigma^T e^{-\int_0^s \mu_F(u)du} C^0(s) \sup_{\sigma \le u \le s} \xi^*(u)\, ds \,\Big|\, \mathcal{F}_\sigma \bigg\}, \tag{4.5}$$

is not possible for $\omega \in \{\sigma < T\}$ since the right-hand side of (4.5) is nonpositive, whereas the left-hand side is always strictly positive. It follows that $\sigma = T$ a.s. and hence $\xi^*(t) < 0$ for all $t \in [0,T)$ a.s. ☐

Proposition 4.2. *There exists a unique upper right-continuous solution* $l^*(t)$ *of*

$$\mathbb{E}\bigg\{ \int_\tau^T e^{-\int_0^s \mu_F(u)du} C^0(s)\, R_c\bigg(C^0(s) \sup_{\tau\le u\le s}\bigg(\frac{l^*(u)}{C^0(u)}\bigg)\bigg)\, ds \,\bigg|\, \mathcal{F}_\tau \bigg\}$$
$$= e^{-\int_0^\tau \mu_F(u)du} \frac{C^0(\tau)}{f_C(\tau)} \mathbb{1}_{\{\tau<T\}} \tag{4.6}$$

for $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$*, and it is given by*

$$l^*(t) := -\frac{C^0(t)}{\xi^*(t)}. \tag{4.7}$$

Proof. With $\xi^*(t) = -\frac{C^0(t)}{l^*(t)}$ as in (4.7), it follows from (4.1) that

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-\int_0^\tau \mu_F(u)du} \frac{C^0(\tau)}{f_C(\tau)} \mathbb{1}_{\{\tau<T\}} &= \mathbb{E}\bigg\{ \int_\tau^T e^{-\int_0^s \mu_F(u)du} C^0(s)\, R_c\bigg(\frac{C^0(s)}{-\sup_{\tau\le u\le s}(-\frac{C^0(u)}{l^*(u)})}\bigg)\, ds \,\bigg|\, \mathcal{F}_\tau \bigg\} \\ &= \mathbb{E}\bigg\{ \int_\tau^T e^{-\int_0^s \mu_F(u)du} C^0(s)\, R_c\bigg(\frac{C^0(s)}{\inf_{\tau\le u\le s}(\frac{C^0(u)}{l^*(u)})}\bigg)\, ds \,\bigg|\, \mathcal{F}_\tau \bigg\} \qquad (4.8) \\ &= \mathbb{E}\bigg\{ \int_\tau^T e^{-\int_0^s \mu_F(u)du} C^0(s)\, R_c\bigg(C^0(s) \sup_{\tau\le u\le s}\bigg(\frac{l^*(u)}{C^0(u)}\bigg)\bigg)\, ds \,\bigg|\, \mathcal{F}_\tau \bigg\}. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, the upper right-continuity of $l^*(t)$ follows from that of $\xi^*(t)$ and from the continuity of $C^0(t)$. □

Notice that $l^*(t)$ may be found numerically from (4.6) by backward induction. In some cases, when $T = +\infty$, (4.6) has a closed form solution as in the case of a Cobb-Douglas production function.

We are now able to find the unique optimally controlled capacity plan for problem (2.7).

Definition 4.3. *For a given optional process* $l(t)$*, the capacity process that tracks* l *is defined as*

$$C^{(l)}(t) := C^0(t)\bigg(y \vee \sup_{0\le u\le t}\bigg(\frac{l(u)}{C^0(u)}\bigg)\bigg). \tag{4.9}$$

Theorem 4.4. *Let* $l^*(t)$ *be the unique solution of (4.6) and let* $C^{(l^*)}$ *be the capacity process that tracks* l^**. Then the investment plan* $\nu^{(l^*)}(t)$ *that finances* $C^{(l^*)}$*, i.e.*

$$d\nu^{(l^*)}(t) = C^{(l^*)}(t)[\mu(t)dt - \sigma(t)dW(t)] + dC^{(l^*)}(t), \quad \textit{with} \quad \nu^{(l^*)}(0) = 0,$$

is optimal for the firm's problem (2.7).

Proof. In order to prove that $C^{(l^*)}(t)$ is the optimal capacity, we only have to show that $C^{(l^*)}(t)$

solves the two first-order conditions of Theorem 3.2. In fact, for all $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}\bigg\{ \int_{\tau}^{T} e^{-\int_0^s \mu_F(u)du} C^0(s)\, R_c\left(C^{(l^*)}(s)\right)\, ds \,\bigg|\, \mathcal{F}_\tau \bigg\} \\
&\quad = \mathbb{E}\bigg\{ \int_{\tau}^{T} e^{-\int_0^s \mu_F(u)du} C^0(s)\, R_c\bigg(C^0(s)\bigg(y \vee \sup_{0\le u\le s}\bigg(\frac{l^*(u)}{C^0(u)}\bigg)\bigg)\bigg)\, ds \,\bigg|\, \mathcal{F}_\tau \bigg\} \qquad (4.10)\\
&\quad \le \mathbb{E}\bigg\{ \int_{\tau}^{T} e^{-\int_0^s \mu_F(u)du} C^0(s)\, R_c\bigg(C^0(s) \sup_{\tau\le u\le s}\bigg(\frac{l^*(u)}{C^0(u)}\bigg)\bigg)\, ds \,\bigg|\, \mathcal{F}_\tau \bigg\} \\
&\quad = e^{-\int_0^\tau \mu_F(u)du} \frac{C^0(\tau)}{f_C(\tau)} \mathbb{1}_{\{\tau<T\}}
\end{aligned}$$

where in the last step we have used (4.6). Notice that in (4.10) we have equality if and only if τ is a time of investment; that is a time of strict increase for $C^{(l^*)}$, i.e. $dC^{(l^*)}(\tau) > 0$. In fact, at such time, we have $C^{(l^*)}(t) = C^0(t) \sup_{\tau\le u\le t}\left(\frac{l^*(u)}{C^0(u)}\right)$ for $t \ge \tau$. Hence (3.4) and (3.5) hold (see also (3.1)) and so $\nu^{(l^*)}(t) \equiv \hat{\nu}(t)$. $\square$

Remark 4.5. *Recall that* $C^{y,\hat{\nu}}(t) = C^0(t)[y + \overline{\nu}^y(t)]$ *(cf. 2.5) where* $\overline{\nu}^y(t) = \int_{[0,t)} \frac{f_C(s)}{C^0(s)} d\hat{\nu}(s)$. *Hence it follows from (4.9) with* $l = l^*$ *that*

$$\overline{\nu}^y(t) = \sup_{0\le u\le t}\left(y \vee \frac{l^*(u)}{C^0(u)}\right) - y. \tag{4.11}$$

Therefore

$$\overline{\nu}^y(t) = \sup_{0\le u\le t}\left(\frac{l^*(u) - yC^0(u)}{C^0(u)}\right) \vee 0. \tag{4.12}$$

5 Identifying the Base Capacity Process

In this Section we find the explicit link between our 'base capacity' approach and the variational approach in Chiarolla and Haussmann [7] based on the shadow value of installed capital, $v := \frac{\partial}{\partial y}V$ (see Appendix A for a generalization of [7] in the case of deterministic, time-dependent coefficients).

We make the following Markovian Assumption

Assumption 5.1. $\mu_C(t)$, $\sigma_C(t)$, $f_C(t)$ *and* $\mu_F(t)$ *are deterministic functions of* $t \in [0,T]$.

Define

$$\begin{aligned}
\Gamma^\xi(t) \;:=\; \operatorname*{ess\,inf}_{t\le\tau\le T} \mathbb{E}\bigg\{ &\int_t^\tau e^{-\int_0^u \mu_F(r)dr} C^0(u)\, R_c\bigg(-\frac{1}{\xi}C^0(u)\bigg)\, du \\
&+ e^{-\int_0^\tau \mu_F(r)dr} C_0(\tau) \frac{1}{f_C(\tau)} \mathbb{1}_{\{\tau<T\}} \bigg| \mathcal{F}_t \bigg\},
\end{aligned} \tag{5.1}$$

for $\xi \in \mathbb{R}$ and $t \in [0,T]$. Then [3], Lemma 4.12 and Lemma 4.13 guarantee that

- the stopping time
$$\tau_t^{\xi} := \inf\left\{ s \in [t,T) : \Gamma^{\xi}(s) = e^{-\int_0^s \mu_F(r)dr} C^0(s) \frac{1}{f_C(s)} \right\} \wedge T \tag{5.2}$$
is optimal for (5.1);
- the optional process
$$\xi^*(t) := \sup\left\{ \xi \in \mathbb{R} : \Gamma^{\xi}(t) = e^{-\int_0^t \mu_F(r)dr} C^0(t) \frac{1}{f_C(t)} \right\}, \quad t \in [0,T), \tag{5.3}$$
is the unique solution of the representation problem (4.1).

We now make an absolutely continuous change of probability measure. In fact, consider the exponential martingale $\mathcal{M}_t(s) := e^{\int_t^s \sigma(u)dW(u) - \frac{1}{2}\int_t^s \sigma^2(u)du}$, $t \in [0,T]$ and $t \le s \le T$, and define the probability measure $\widetilde{\mathbb{P}}_t$ by $\widetilde{\mathbb{P}}_t(A) := \mathbb{E}\left\{\mathcal{M}_t(T)\mathbb{1}_A\right\}$, for $A \in \widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_{t,T} := \sigma\{W(u) - W(t), t \le u \le T\}$. Then the Radon-Nikodym derivative is
$$\left.\frac{d\widetilde{\mathbb{P}}_t}{d\mathbb{P}}\right|_{\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_{t,s}} = \mathcal{M}_t(s), \qquad s \in [0,T], \tag{5.4}$$
and the process $\widetilde{W}^t(s) := W(s) - W(t) - \int_t^s \sigma(u)du$ is a standard Brownian motion under $\widetilde{\mathbb{P}}_t$. We denote by $\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}_t\left\{\cdot\right\}$ the expectation w.r.t. $\widetilde{\mathbb{P}}_t$.

Hence under $\widetilde{\mathbb{P}} := \widetilde{\mathbb{P}}_0$ the process $e^{\int_0^t \mu_F(r)dr}\frac{\Gamma^{\xi}(t)}{C^0(t)}$ may be written as
$$\widetilde{\Gamma}^{\xi}(t) := \operatorname*{ess\,inf}_{t \le \tau \le T} \widetilde{\mathbb{E}}\left\{ \int_t^{\tau} e^{-\int_t^u \overline{\mu}(r)dr} R_c\left(-\frac{1}{\xi}C^0(u)\right) du + e^{-\int_t^{\tau} \overline{\mu}(r)dr} \frac{1}{f_C(\tau)} \mathbb{1}_{\{\tau<T\}} \,\middle|\, \mathcal{F}_t \right\}, \tag{5.5}$$
and so the optional process $\xi^*(t)$ (cf. 5.3) is
$$\xi^*(t) = \sup\left\{ \xi \in \mathbb{R} : \widetilde{\Gamma}^{\xi}(t) = \frac{1}{f_C(t)} \right\}. \tag{5.6}$$
In fact,
$$\begin{aligned}\xi^*(t) = \sup\Bigg\{ \xi \in \mathbb{R} : \operatorname*{ess\,inf}_{t \le \tau \le T} \mathbb{E}\Bigg\{ & \int_t^{\tau} e^{-\int_t^u \mu_F(r)dr} \frac{C^0(u)}{C^0(t)} R_c\left(-\frac{1}{\xi}C^0(u)\right) du \\ & + e^{-\int_t^{\tau} \mu_F(r)dr} \frac{C_0(\tau)}{C^0(t)} \frac{1}{f_C(\tau)} \mathbb{1}_{\{\tau<T\}} \,\Bigg|\, \mathcal{F}_t \Bigg\} = \frac{1}{f_C(t)} \Bigg\},\end{aligned}$$
and by the continuous time Bayes' Rule (see e.g. [15]), we obtain
$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{E}\left\{ \int_t^{\tau} e^{-\int_t^u \mu_F(r)dr} \frac{C^0(u)}{C^0(t)} R_c\left(-\frac{1}{\xi}C^0(u)\right) du + e^{-\int_t^{\tau} \mu_F(r)dr} \frac{C_0(\tau)}{C^0(t)} \frac{1}{f_C(\tau)} \mathbb{1}_{\{\tau<T\}} \,\middle|\, \mathcal{F}_t \right\} \\ &\quad = \widetilde{\mathbb{E}}\left\{ \int_t^{\tau} e^{-\int_t^u \overline{\mu}(r)dr} R_c\left(-\frac{1}{\xi}C^0(u)\right) du + e^{-\int_t^{\tau} \overline{\mu}(r)dr} \frac{1}{f_C(\tau)} \mathbb{1}_{\{\tau<T\}} \,\middle|\, \mathcal{F}_t \right\}\end{aligned}$$
with $\overline{\mu}(t) := \mu_C(t) + \mu_F(t)$. Now (5.6) follows from (5.5).

For an appropriate value of ξ, we are now able to link $\widetilde{\Gamma}^{\xi}(t)$ to $v(t,y)$, the shadow value of installed capital (cf. (A-14)).

Proposition 5.2. *With* $\widetilde{\Gamma}^{\xi}(t)$ *as in (5.5) and* $v(t,y)$ *as in (A-14), that is*

$$v(t,y) = \inf_{t\leq\tau\leq T} \widetilde{\mathbb{E}}_t\bigg\{ \int_t^\tau e^{-\int_t^u \overline{\mu}(r)dr}\, R_c\left(Y^{t,y}(u)\right) du + e^{-\int_t^\tau \overline{\mu}(r)dr}\frac{1}{f_C(\tau)}\mathbb{1}_{\{\tau<T\}}\bigg\}, \tag{5.7}$$

we have

$$\widetilde{\Gamma}^{-\frac{1}{y}}(t) = v\left(t, yC^0(t)\right). \tag{5.8}$$

Proof. The proof borrows arguments from [6], Theorem 4.1. As in Appendix A we set $Y^{t,y}(s) := y\widetilde{C}^t(s) = yC^{t,1,0}(s)$ for $s \geq t$ (cf. (A-2)). Then, for $t \in [0,T)$ and $\tau \in [t,T]$, notice that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}\bigg\{ \int_t^\tau e^{-\int_t^u \overline{\mu}(r)dr}\, R_c\left(yC^0(u)\right)\, du \,+ e^{-\int_t^\tau \overline{\mu}(r)dr}\frac{1}{f_C(\tau)}\mathbb{1}_{\{\tau<T\}}\bigg|\, \mathcal{F}_t\bigg\}\\
&\quad= \widetilde{\mathbb{E}}\bigg\{ \int_t^\tau e^{-\int_t^u \overline{\mu}(r)dr}\, R_c\left(Y^{t,yC^0(t)}(u)\right)\, du \,+ e^{-\int_t^\tau \overline{\mu}(r)dr}\frac{1}{f_C(\tau)}\mathbb{1}_{\{\tau<T\}}\bigg|\, \mathcal{F}_t\bigg\} \qquad (5.9)\\
&\quad= \widetilde{\mathbb{E}}\bigg\{ \int_t^\tau e^{-\int_t^u \overline{\mu}(r)dr}\, R_c\left(yC^0(t)\widetilde{C}^t(u)\right)\, du \,+ e^{-\int_t^\tau \overline{\mu}(r)dr}\frac{1}{f_C(\tau)}\mathbb{1}_{\{\tau<T\}}\bigg|\, \mathcal{F}_t\bigg\}.
\end{aligned}$$

In order to take care of the conditioning, it is convenient to work on the canonical probability space $\left(\overline{\Omega},\overline{\mathbb{P}}\right)$, where $\overline{\mathbb{P}}$ is the Wiener measure on $\overline{\Omega} := \mathcal{C}_0\left([0,T]\right)$, the space of all continuous functions on $[0,T]$ which are zero at $t=0$. In fact, we may take $\widetilde{W}^0(\cdot) = \overline{\omega} = (\overline{\omega}_1, \overline{\omega}_2)$ where $\overline{\omega}_1 = \left\{\widetilde{W}^0(v), 0 \leq v \leq t\right\}$ and $\overline{\omega}_2 = \left\{\widetilde{W}^0(v) - \widetilde{W}^0(t), t \leq v \leq T\right\} = \left\{\widetilde{W}'(v), 0 \leq v \leq T-t\right\}$. Since Brownian increments are independent then $\overline{\mathbb{P}}$ is a product-measure on $\mathcal{C}_0\left([0,T]\right) = \mathcal{C}_0\left([0,t]\right) \times \mathcal{C}_0\left([0,T-t]\right)$ and $\tau \geq t$ $\widetilde{\mathbb{P}}$-a.s. may be written in the form $\tau\left(\overline{\omega}_1,\overline{\omega}_2\right) = t + \tau'_{\overline{\omega}_1}\left(\overline{\omega}_2\right)$ with $\tau'_{\overline{\omega}_1}(\cdot)$ a $\left\{F_v^{\widetilde{W}'}\right\}_{0\leq v\leq T-t}$-stopping time for every $\overline{\omega}_1$. Then, since $\widetilde{C}^t(\cdot)$ is independent of $\mathcal{F}_t$, the last conditional expectation in (5.9) is equal to

$$\begin{aligned}
&\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}_{\overline{\omega}_2}\bigg\{ \int_t^{t+\tau'_{\overline{\omega}_1}} e^{-\int_t^u \overline{\mu}(r)dr}\, R_c\left(yC^0(t)\widetilde{C}^t(u)\right)\, du \,+ e^{-\int_t^{t+\tau'_{\overline{\omega}_1}} \overline{\mu}(r)dr}\frac{1}{f_C(t+\tau'_{\overline{\omega}_1})}\mathbb{1}_{\{\tau'_{\overline{\omega}_1}+t<T\}}\bigg\}\\
&\quad= \widetilde{\mathbb{E}}_t\bigg\{ \int_t^\tau e^{-\int_t^u \overline{\mu}(r)dr}\, R_c\left(Y^{t,yC^0(t)}(u)\right)\, du \,+ e^{-\int_t^\tau \overline{\mu}(r)dr}\frac{1}{f_C(\tau)}\mathbb{1}_{\{\tau<T\}}\bigg\} \qquad (5.10)
\end{aligned}$$

where $\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}_{\overline{\omega}_2}\{\cdot\}$ denotes expectation over $\overline{\omega}_2$ or W'. Hence (5.8) follows from (5.5) and (5.7). ☐

Notice that the process $\xi^*(t)$ is negative for all $t \in [0,T)$ a.s. (cf. Lemma 4.1), then for $t \in [0,T)$ it must be $\xi^*(t) = \sup\left\{\xi < 0 : \Gamma^{\xi}(t) = e^{-rt}C^0(t)\frac{1}{f_C(t)}\right\}$ or equivalently $\xi^*(t) = \sup\left\{\xi < 0 : \widetilde{\Gamma}^{\xi}(t) = \frac{1}{f_C(t)}\right\}$.

The following Proposition provides another representation of the base capacity $l^*(t) := -\frac{C^0(t)}{\xi^*(t)}$ (cf. (4.7)).

Proposition 5.3. *The base capacity* $l^*(t)$*, unique solution of (4.6), admits the representation*

$$l^*(t) = \sup\left\{y\, C^0(t) > 0 : v\left(t, y\, C^0(t)\right) = \frac{1}{f_C(t)}\right\}. \tag{5.11}$$

Proof. For $t \in [0,T)$ and $y > 0$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} l^*(t) \;&:=\; -\frac{C^0(t)}{\xi^*(t)} = -\frac{C^0(t)}{\sup\left\{\xi < 0 : \widetilde{\Gamma}^{\xi}(t) = \frac{1}{f_C(t)}\right\}} = -\frac{C^0(t)}{\sup\left\{-\frac{1}{y} < 0 : \widetilde{\Gamma}^{-\frac{1}{y}}(t) = \frac{1}{f_C(t)}\right\}} \\ &= \frac{C^0(t)}{-\sup\left\{-\frac{1}{y} < 0 : \widetilde{\Gamma}^{-\frac{1}{y}}(t) = \frac{1}{f_C(t)}\right\}} = \frac{C^0(t)}{\inf\left\{\frac{1}{y} > 0 : \widetilde{\Gamma}^{-\frac{1}{y}}(t) = \frac{1}{f_C(t)}\right\}} \\ &= C^0(t)\,\sup\left\{y > 0 : \widetilde{\Gamma}^{-\frac{1}{y}}(t) = \frac{1}{f_C(t)}\right\} = \sup\left\{\,yC^0(t) > 0 : \widetilde{\Gamma}^{-\frac{1}{y}}(t) = \frac{1}{f_C(t)}\right\} \\ &= \sup\left\{\,y\,C^0(t) > 0 : v\left(t, y\,C^0(t)\right) = \frac{1}{f_C(t)}\right\} \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows from Proposition 5.2. □

Notice that $v(t,y) \leq \frac{1}{f_C(t)}$ for all $t \in [0,T)$ and $y > 0$. As in [7], (3.19), introduce the *Continuation Region* (or 'no-action region') of problem (5.7)

$$D := \left\{(t,y) \in [0,T) \times (0,\infty) : v(t,y) < \frac{1}{f_C(t)}\right\}. \tag{5.12}$$

This is a Borel set and, roughly speaking, D is the region where it is not profitable to invest, since the expected marginal profit is strictly less than the capital's replacement cost. Similarly its complement is the *Stopping Region* (or 'action region'), i.e.

$$D^c := \left\{(t,y) \in [0,T) \times (0,\infty) : v(t,y) = \frac{1}{f_C(t)}\right\}, \tag{5.13}$$

is the region where it is profitable to invest immediately.

The boundary between these two regions is the free boundary $\hat{y}(t)$ of the optimal stopping problem (5.7).

Theorem 5.4. *The base capacity process $l^*(t)$, unique solution of (4.6), is deterministic and coincides with the free boundary $\hat{y}(t)$ associated to the optimal stopping problem (5.7). Hence*

$$l^*(t) = \sup\left\{\,z > 0 : v(t,z) = \frac{1}{f_C(t)}\right\} \qquad \textit{for } t \in [0,T). \tag{5.14}$$

Proof. Recall (5.11). Fix $t \in [0,T)$ and set

$$z(\omega,y) := yC^0(\omega,t).$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \left\{\,yC^0(\omega,t) > 0 : v\left(t, yC^0(\omega,t)\right) = \frac{1}{f_C(t)}\right\} \;&=\; \left\{\,z(\omega,y) > 0 : v(t, z(\omega,y)) = \frac{1}{f_C(t)}\right\} \\ &\subseteq\; \left\{\,z > 0 : v(t,z) = \frac{1}{f_C(t)}\right\} \end{aligned}$$

for a.e. $\omega \in \Omega$ and $y > 0$, hence the inclusion holds a.s. for all $y > 0$.

To show the reverse inclusion, fix $\omega \in \Omega$ and $t \in [0,T)$, then for $z > 0$ define

$$y(\omega, z) := \frac{z}{C^0(\omega, t)}$$

so that that every $z > 0$ may be written as $z = y(z,\omega)C^0(t,\omega)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}\left\{ z > 0 : v(t,z) = \frac{1}{f_C(t)} \right\} &= \left\{ y(\omega,z)C^0(\omega,t) > 0 : v\left(t, y(\omega,z)C^0(\omega,t)\right) = \frac{1}{f_C(t)} \right\} \\ &\subseteq \left\{ yC^0(\omega,t) > 0 : v\left(t, yC^0(\omega,t)\right) = \frac{1}{f_C(t)} \right\}.\end{aligned}$$

This inclusion holds for a.e. $\omega \in \Omega$, hence a.s. Hence, it holds $\widetilde{\mathbb{P}}$-a.s. that

$$\sup\left\{ yC^0(\omega,t) > 0 : v\left(t, yC^0(\omega,t)\right) = \frac{1}{f_C(t)} \right\} = \sup\left\{ z > 0 : v(t,z) = \frac{1}{f_C(t)} \right\} \tag{5.15}$$

and $l^*(t)$ is deterministic (cf. (5.11)). Now the right-hand side of (5.15) (cf. [7], (3.13)) identifies $l^*(t)$ with the free boundary $\hat{y}(t)$ of problem (5.7). ☐

Since $\hat{y}(t)$ coincides with $l^*(t)$, equation (4.6) provides an integral equation for the free boundary $\hat{y}(t)$.

Theorem 5.5. *The free boundary $\hat{y}(t)$ of problem (5.7) is the unique upper right-continuous solution of the integral equation*

$$\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}\left\{ \int_0^{T-t} e^{-\int_t^{v+t} \overline{\mu}(r)dr} R_c\left(\sup_{0 \le u' \le v} \left(\hat{y}(u'+t) \frac{C^0(v+t)}{C^0(u'+t)} \right) \right) dv \right\} = \frac{1}{f_C(t)}, \quad t \in [0,T). \tag{5.16}$$

Proof. Fix $t \in [0,T)$. Set $\tau = t$ and recall that $l^*(t) = \hat{y}(t)$. Then write (4.6) under $\widetilde{\mathbb{P}}$ and apply the continuous time Bayes' Rule to obtain

$$\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}\left\{ \int_0^{T-t} e^{-\int_t^{v+t} \overline{\mu}(r)dr} R_c\left(\sup_{0 \le u' \le v} \left(\hat{y}(u'+t) \frac{C^0(v+t)}{C^0(u'+t)} \right) \right) dv \,\Big|\, \mathcal{F}_t \right\} = \frac{1}{f_C(t)}.$$

Now (5.16) follows since $\frac{C^0(v+t)}{C^0(u'+t)}$, $v > u' \ge 0$, is independent of $\mathcal{F}_t$. ☐

We now aim to obtain paths' regularity of the free boundary $\hat{y}(t)$ of problem (5.7) from the fact that it coincides with the base capacity process $l^*(t)$. Recall that $l^*(t)$ has upper right-continuous paths on $[0,T)$ and satisfies $l^*(t) > 0$ on $[0,T)$ a.s. (cf. Lemma 4.1).

As in [7], Section 4, we make the following assumptions

Assumption 5.6.

1. *$R(C) = \frac{1}{\alpha}C^\alpha$ with $\alpha \in (0,1)$ (i.e. Cobb-Douglas production function);*
2. $\mu_C(t) \equiv \mu_C, \quad \sigma_C(t) \equiv \sigma_C, \quad \mu_F(t) \equiv \mu_F, \quad f_C(t) \equiv f_C.$

Remark 5.7. *Notice that under Assumption 5.6, part 2, the process* $\frac{C^0(v+t)}{C^0(u'+t)}$ *has the same law as* $\frac{C^0(v)}{C^0(u')}$. *Hence, the integral equation (5.16) takes the form*

$$\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}\left\{\int_0^{T-t} e^{-\overline{\mu}v} R_c\left(\sup_{0\le u'\le v}\left(\hat{y}(u'+t)\frac{C^0(v)}{C^0(u')}\right)\right)dv\right\} = \frac{1}{f_C(t)}. \tag{5.17}$$

Under Assumption 5.6, the properties of the free boundary obtained in [7] hold. The novelty is the continuity of $\hat{y}(t)$ which we prove thanks to its identification with $l^*(t)$.

Theorem 5.8. *Let Assumptions 5.6 hold and recall that* $\hat{y}(t)$ *is the function representing the free boundary between the continuation region* D *and the stopping region* D^c. *Then we have*

1. $\hat{y}(t) > 0$ *on* $t \in [0, T)$;
2. $\hat{y}(T-) = 0$;
3. $\hat{y}(t)$ *is nonincreasing for* $t \in [0, T)$;
4. $\hat{y}(t)$ *is left-continuous for* $t \in [0, T)$;
5. $\hat{y}(t)$ *is continuous on* $t \in [0, T)$.

Proof. Property 1 follows from the analogous property of $l^*(t)$ (see Lemma 4.1). For the proof of properties 2, 3 and 4 see [7], Proposition 4.3. To prove property 5 recall that $l^*(t)$ has upper right-continuous paths (see Lemma 4.1), but $l^*(t) = \hat{y}(t)$ admits right-hand limits thanks to property 3, then it is right-continuous, i.e.

$$l^*(t) = \limsup_{s\downarrow t} l^*(s) = \lim_{s\downarrow t} l^*(s).$$

Hence the continuity of $\hat{y}(t)$ follows from property 4. □

Notice that property 5 was assumed in [7] (see [7], Assumption-[Cfb]). Chiarolla and Haussmann in [7] stressed that the data regularity of problem (5.7) gave no indication that continuity of the free boundary should fail, but they were unable to prove it, as they could not show its right-continuity. In fact arguments similar to those used in [12] for the free boundary of the American put did not apply being the value function of their stopping problem an inf rather than a sup as in the option problem.

In this Section we have linked the Bank-El Karoui's probabilistic approach to the variational approach followed by Chiarolla and Haussmann in [6] and [7] for an irreversible investment problem similar to (2.7). Under Markovian assumptions we have proved that the base capacity process $l^*(t)$ is a deterministic process and it coincides with the free-boundary of the optimal stopping problem (5.7). Moreover, in the Cobb-Douglas case, we have obtained its continuity so to remove Assumption-[Cfb] in [7]. We have characterized the free boundary as the unique solution of an integral equation based on the stochastic Representation Theorem of [3]. Even under Assumption 5.6, the integral equation for the free boundary (5.16) cannot be analitically solved when the time horizon is finite. However it is possible to find a curve bounding the free boundary from above. In Section 6 we shall see that, instead, when $T = +\infty$ (as in H. Pham [16]) the free boundary is a constant whose value we find explicitly by applying Proposition 6.1.

Recall that $T < +\infty$.

Proposition 5.9. *Under Assumption 5.6 the boundary $\hat{y}(t)$ of the continuation region D satisfies*

$$\hat{y}(t) \le \left[f_C \left(\frac{1 - e^{-(\mu_F + \alpha\mu_C + \frac{1}{2}\alpha(1-\alpha)\sigma_C^2)(T-t)}}{\mu_F + \alpha\mu_C + \frac{1}{2}\alpha(1-\alpha)\sigma_C^2} \right) \right]^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}} =: y^*(t), \tag{5.18}$$

for every $t \in [0,T)$.

Proof. Fix $t \in [0,T)$. The representation formula (4.6) for $\tau = t$ and in the Cobb-Douglas case becomes

$$e^{-\mu_F t} \frac{1}{f_C} = \mathbb{E}\left\{ \int_t^T e^{-\mu_F s} \frac{C^0(s)}{C^0(t)} \left(\sup_{t \le u \le s} \left(C^0(s) \frac{l^*(u)}{C^0(u)} \right) \right)^{\alpha-1} ds \,\middle|\, \mathcal{F}_t \right\}. \tag{5.19}$$

Set $\widetilde{\mu}_C := \mu_C + \frac{1}{2}\sigma_C^2$, then the right-hand side of (5.19) gives

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}\left\{ \int_t^T e^{-\mu_F s} \frac{C^0(s)}{C^0(t)} \left(\sup_{t \le u \le s} \left(C^0(s) \frac{l^*(u)}{C^0(u)} \right) \right)^{\alpha-1} ds \,\middle|\, \mathcal{F}_t \right\} \\
&\quad = \mathbb{E}\left\{ \int_t^T e^{-\mu_F s}\, e^{-\widetilde{\mu}_C (s-t) + \sigma_C (W(s) - W(t))} \right. \\
&\qquad\qquad\qquad \left. \times \inf_{t \le u \le s} \left([l^*(u)]^{\alpha-1}\, e^{(\alpha-1)(-\widetilde{\mu}_C(s-u) + \sigma_C(W(s)-W(u)))} \right) ds \,\middle|\, \mathcal{F}_t \right\} \\
&\quad \le \mathbb{E}\left\{ \int_t^T e^{-\mu_F s}\, e^{-\widetilde{\mu}_C (s-t) + \sigma_C (W(s) - W(t))}\, [l^*(t)]^{\alpha-1}\, e^{(\alpha-1)(-\widetilde{\mu}_C(s-t) + \sigma_C(W(s)-W(t)))}\, ds \,\middle|\, \mathcal{F}_t \right\} \\
&\quad = e^{-\mu_F t}\, [l^*(t)]^{\alpha-1}\, \mathbb{E}\left\{ \int_0^{T-t} e^{-\mu_F v}\, e^{-\widetilde{\mu}_C v + \sigma_C(W(v+t) - W(t))} \right. \\
&\qquad\qquad\qquad \left. \times e^{(\alpha-1)(-\widetilde{\mu}_C v + \sigma_C(W(v+t)-W(t)))}\, dv \,\middle|\, \mathcal{F}_t \right\}
\end{aligned} \tag{5.20}$$

Since the Brownian increments in the integral above are independent of $\mathcal{F}_t$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}\left\{ \int_t^T e^{-\mu_F s} \frac{C^0(s)}{C^0(t)} \left(\sup_{t \le u \le s} \left(C^0(s) \frac{l^*(u)}{C^0(u)} \right) \right)^{\alpha-1} ds \,\middle|\, \mathcal{F}_t \right\} \\
&\quad \le e^{-\mu_F t}\, [l^*(t)]^{\alpha-1}\, \mathbb{E}\left\{ \int_0^{T-t} e^{-\mu_F v}\, e^{-\widetilde{\mu}_C v + \sigma_C(W(v+t) - W(t))} \right. \\
&\qquad\qquad\qquad \left. \times e^{(\alpha-1)(-\widetilde{\mu}_C v + \sigma_C(W(v+t)-W(t)))} \right\} dv \\
&\quad = e^{-\mu_F t}\, [l^*(t)]^{\alpha-1} \int_0^{T-t} e^{-\mu_F v}\, \mathbb{E}\left\{ e^{\alpha(-\widetilde{\mu}_C v + \sigma_C(W(v+t)-W(t)))} \right\} dv \\
&\quad = e^{-\mu_F t}\, [l^*(t)]^{\alpha-1} \int_0^{T-t} e^{-\mu_F v} e^{-\alpha\widetilde{\mu}_C v}\, \mathbb{E}\left\{ e^{\alpha\sigma_C W(v)} \right\} dv \\
&\quad = e^{-\mu_F t}\, [l^*(t)]^{\alpha-1} \int_0^{T-t} e^{-\mu_F v} e^{-\alpha\widetilde{\mu}_C v}\, e^{\frac{1}{2}\alpha^2\sigma_C^2\, v}\, dv.
\end{aligned} \tag{5.21}$$

Notice that

$$\mu_F + \alpha\widetilde{\mu}_C - \frac{1}{2}\alpha^2\sigma_C^2 = \mu_F + \alpha\mu_C + \frac{1}{2}\alpha(1-\alpha)\sigma_C^2 > 0,$$

hence (5.19) and (5.21) imply that

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-\mu_F t}\frac{1}{f_C} &\leq e^{-\mu_F t}\,[l^*(t)]^{\alpha-1}\int_0^{T-t} e^{-\left(\mu_F+\alpha\mu_C+\frac{1}{2}\alpha(1-\alpha)\sigma_C^2\right)v}\,dv \\ &= e^{-\mu_F t}\,[l^*(t)]^{\alpha-1}\left(\frac{1-e^{-\left(\mu_F+\alpha\mu_C+\frac{1}{2}\alpha(1-\alpha)\sigma_C^2\right)(T-t)}}{\mu_F+\alpha\mu_C+\frac{1}{2}\alpha(1-\alpha)\sigma_C^2}\right). \end{aligned} \tag{5.22}$$

Now (5.22) gives

$$[l^*(t)]^{1-\alpha} \leq f_C\left(\frac{1-e^{-\left(\mu_F+\alpha\mu_C+\frac{1}{2}\alpha(1-\alpha)\sigma_C^2\right)(T-t)}}{\mu_F+\alpha\mu_C+\frac{1}{2}\alpha(1-\alpha)\sigma_C^2}\right) =: y^*(t)^{1-\alpha}, \tag{5.23}$$

and (5.18) follows from the identification of $l^*(\cdot)$ with $\hat{y}(\cdot)$ (cf. Theorem 5.4). □

Remark 5.10. *Notice that the curve $y^*(t)$ is exactly what in [6] was incorrectly identified as the free boundary between the 'action' and the 'no-action' regions. In [7] the authors characterized the free boundary $\widehat{y}(t)$ as the unique solution of a nonlinear integral equation (see [7], Theorem 4.8). Then, by using a discrete approximation of such integral equation, they showed that $\widehat{y}(t) \leq y^*(t)$, for $t \leq T$. That is exactly what we prove here in Proposition 5.9.*

Remark 5.11. *Notice that the arguments in the proof of Proposition 5.9 apply even under the more general conditions of Assumption 5.1. That is, under deterministic, time-dependent coefficients we have*

$$\hat{y}(t) \leq \left[f_C(t)\int_0^{T-t} e^{-\int_t^{v+t}\left(\mu_F(s)+\alpha\mu_C(s)+\frac{1}{2}\alpha(1-\alpha)\sigma_C^2(s)\right)ds}dv\right]^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}}, \quad \forall t \in [0,T).$$

6 Explicit Results when $T = +\infty$

In this Section, with $T = +\infty$ and under Assumption 5.6, we set $f_C = 1$ in order to compare our finding with the results in H. Pham [16]. As one would expect, when the time horizon is infinite, the free boundary is a point. That is what we show below.

Proposition 6.1. *The unique solution of the representation problem (4.6) is given by*

$$l^*(t) = \left[\frac{2}{2\mu_F - \sigma_C^2\beta_- - \alpha\sigma_C^2(1+\beta_+)}\right]^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}} =: a \tag{6.1}$$

where $\beta_\pm$ are, respectively, the positive and negative roots of $\frac{1}{2}\sigma_C^2 x^2 + \widetilde{\mu}_C x - \mu_F = 0$ with $\widetilde{\mu}_C := \mu_C + \frac{1}{2}\sigma_C^2$.

Hence (cf. Definition 4.3 and Theorem 4.4) the optimal capacity is given by

$$C^{y,\hat{\nu}}(t) = C^{(a)}(t) \equiv C^0(t)\left(y \vee \sup_{0\leq u\leq t}\left(\frac{a}{C^0(u)}\right)\right). \tag{6.2}$$

Proof. We make the *ansatz* that $l^*(t) \equiv a$ for all $t \in [0, \infty)$ and we plug it into the left-hand side of (4.6) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& a^{\alpha-1}\,\mathbb{E}\bigg\{ \int_\tau^\infty e^{-\mu_F s}\frac{C^0(s)}{C^0(\tau)}\left[\sup_{\tau\le u\le s}\left(\frac{C^0(s)}{C^0(u)}\right)\right]^{\alpha-1} ds \,\bigg|\, \mathcal{F}_\tau \bigg\} \\
&= a^{\alpha-1}\,\mathbb{E}\bigg\{ \int_\tau^\infty e^{-\mu_F s}\frac{C^0(s)}{C^0(\tau)} \inf_{\tau\le u\le s}\left(\left[\frac{C^0(s)}{C^0(u)}\right]^{\alpha-1}\right) ds \,\bigg|\, \mathcal{F}_\tau \bigg\} \\
&= a^{\alpha-1}\,\mathbb{E}\bigg\{ \int_\tau^\infty e^{-\mu_F s} e^{\sigma_C(W(s)-W(\tau))-\widetilde{\mu}_C(s-\tau)} \\
&\qquad\qquad \times \inf_{0\le u'\le s-\tau}\left[e^{\sigma_C(W(s)-W(u'+\tau))-\widetilde{\mu}_C(s-u'-\tau)}\right]^{(\alpha-1)} ds \,\bigg|\, \mathcal{F}_\tau \bigg\} \\
&= a^{\alpha-1}e^{-\mu_F\tau}\,\mathbb{E}\bigg\{ \int_0^\infty e^{-\mu_F v} e^{\sigma_C W(v)-\widetilde{\mu}_C v} \inf_{0\le u'\le v}\left(e^{(\alpha-1)(\sigma_C(W(v)-W(u'))-\widetilde{\mu}_C(v-u'))}\right) dv \bigg\}
\end{aligned} \tag{6.3}$$

since the Brownian increments are independent of $\mathcal{F}_\tau$.

If we now define $Y(v) := \widetilde{\mu}_C v - \sigma_C W(v)$, $\underline{Y}(v) := \inf_{0\le u'<v} Y(u')$ and $\overline{Y}(v) := \sup_{0\le u'<v} Y(u')$, then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& a^{\alpha-1}e^{-\mu_F\tau}\,\mathbb{E}\bigg\{ \int_0^\infty e^{-\mu_F v} e^{\sigma_C W(v)-\widetilde{\mu}_C v} \inf_{0\le u'\le v}\left(e^{(\alpha-1)(\sigma_C(W(v)-W(u'))-\widetilde{\mu}_C(v-u'))}\right) dv \bigg\} \\
&= a^{\alpha-1}e^{-\mu_F\tau}\,\mathbb{E}\bigg\{ \int_0^\infty e^{-\mu_F v} e^{-\alpha(\widetilde{\mu}_C v-\sigma_C W(v))}\, e^{\sup_{0\le u'\le v}[(\alpha-1)(\widetilde{\mu}_C u'-\sigma_C W(u'))]}\, dv \bigg\} \\
&= a^{\alpha-1}e^{-\mu_F\tau}\,\mathbb{E}\bigg\{ \int_0^\infty e^{-\mu_F v} e^{-\alpha Y(v)} e^{(\alpha-1)\overline{Y}(v)} dv \bigg\} \\
&= \frac{1}{\mu_F}a^{\alpha-1}e^{-\mu_F\tau}\,\mathbb{E}\bigg\{ \int_0^\infty \mu_F\, e^{-\mu_F v} e^{-\alpha\left(Y(v)-\overline{Y}(v)\right)} e^{-\overline{Y}(v)}\, dv \bigg\} \\
&= \frac{1}{\mu_F}a^{\alpha-1}e^{-\mu_F\tau}\,\mathbb{E}\left\{ e^{-\alpha\left(Y(\tau(\mu_F))-\overline{Y}(\tau(\mu_F))\right)} e^{-\overline{Y}(\tau(\mu_F))} \right\}
\end{aligned} \tag{6.4}$$

where $\tau(\mu_F)$ denotes an independent exponential distributed random time.

Using the Excursion Theory for Levy processes (cf. [5]), $Y - \overline{Y}$ is independent of $\overline{Y}$, and by the Duality Theorem, $Y - \overline{Y}$ has the same distribution of $\underline{Y}$. Hence from (6.4) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{\mu_F}a^{\alpha-1}e^{-\mu_F\tau}\,\mathbb{E}\left\{ e^{-\alpha\left(Y(\tau(\mu_F))-\overline{Y}(\tau(\mu_F))\right)} e^{-\overline{Y}(\tau(\mu_F))} \right\} \\
&\qquad = \frac{1}{\mu_F}a^{\alpha-1}e^{-\mu_F\tau}\,\mathbb{E}\left\{ e^{-\alpha\underline{Y}(\tau(\mu_F))} \right\}\mathbb{E}\left\{ e^{-\overline{Y}(\tau(\mu_F))} \right\}.
\end{aligned} \tag{6.5}$$

It is well known that for a Brownian motion with drift

$$\mathbb{E}\left\{ e^{z\overline{Y}(\tau(\mu_F))} \right\} = \frac{\beta_+}{\beta_+ - z} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \mathbb{E}\left\{ e^{z\underline{Y}(\tau(\mu_F))} \right\} = \frac{\beta_-}{\beta_- - z},$$

if β_+ and β_- are, respectively, the positive and negative roots of $\frac{1}{2}\sigma_C^2 x^2 + \widetilde{\mu}_C x - \mu_F = 0$, i.e.

$$\beta_\pm = -\frac{\widetilde{\mu}_C}{\sigma_C^2} \pm \sqrt{\left(\frac{\widetilde{\mu}_C}{\sigma_C^2}\right)^2 + \frac{2\mu_F}{\sigma_C^2}}.$$

Hence (cf. (4.6))

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-\mu_F\tau} &= \mathbb{E}\bigg\{ \int_\tau^\infty e^{-\mu_F s} \frac{C^0(s)}{C^0(\tau)} \bigg[C^0(s) \sup_{\tau \le u \le s} \bigg(\frac{l^*(u)}{C^0(u)} \bigg) \bigg]^{\alpha-1} ds \, \bigg| \, \mathcal{F}_\tau \bigg\} \\ &= \frac{1}{\mu_F} a^{\alpha-1} e^{-\mu_F\tau} \mathbb{E}\left\{ e^{-\alpha \underline{Y}(\tau(\mu_F))} \right\} \mathbb{E}\left\{ e^{-\overline{Y}(\tau(\mu_F))} \right\} \\ &= \frac{1}{\mu_F} a^{\alpha-1} e^{-\mu_F\tau} \frac{\beta_+\beta_-}{(1+\beta_+)(\alpha+\beta_-)}. \end{aligned} \tag{6.6}$$

Then, we solve for a and we obtain

$$a^{\alpha-1} = \bigg(\frac{\mu_F(1+\beta_+)(\alpha+\beta_-)}{\beta_+\beta_-} \bigg),$$

which may also be written as

$$a = \bigg(\frac{2}{2\mu_F - \sigma_C^2\beta_- - \alpha\sigma_C^2(1+\beta_+)} \bigg)^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}}$$

being $\beta_+\beta_- = -\frac{2\mu_F}{\sigma_C^2}$.

Hence (cf. Theorem 4.4) the optimal capacity is

$$C^{y,\hat{\nu}}(t) = C^{(a)}(t) = C^0(t) \bigg(y \vee \sup_{0 \le u \le t} \bigg(\frac{a}{C^0(u)} \bigg) \bigg). \tag{6.7}$$

□

From Remark 4.5 we have

$$\overline{\nu}^y(t) = \sup_{0 \le u \le t} \bigg(\frac{a - yC^0(u)}{C^0(u)} \bigg) \vee 0, \tag{6.8}$$

and the corresponding control $\hat{\nu}(t)$ (cf. (2.2)) makes the diffusion reflect at the boundary a, it is the local time of $C^{y,\hat{\nu}}(t)$ at a.

Notice that the boundary a in (6.1) coincides with the free boundary k_b obtained by H. Pham in [16] for a unit cost of investment p. In fact from [16], Example 1.5.1

$$k_b^{\alpha-1} = \frac{1-m}{C(\alpha-m)},$$

with

$$C = \frac{1}{\mu_F + \alpha\widetilde{\mu}_C - \frac{\alpha^2\sigma_C^2}{2}} \qquad \text{and} \qquad m = -\beta_+.$$

It is easy to see that

$$a^{\alpha-1} = \frac{\mu_F(1+\beta_+)(\alpha+\beta_-)}{\beta_+\beta_-} = \frac{1-m}{C(\alpha-m)} = k_b^{\alpha-1}, \tag{6.9}$$

hence $a = k_b$.

Remark 6.2. *For a general production function $R(\cdot)$ satisfying Assumption 2.1, to find the free boundary a one should solve the analogue of (6.6), i.e.*

$$\frac{1}{\mu_F}\mathbb{E}\left\{e^{-\underline{Y}(\tau(\mu_F))}R_c\left(a\,e^{-\underline{Y}(\tau(\mu_F))}\right)\right\}\mathbb{E}\left\{e^{-\overline{Y}(\tau(\mu_F))}\right\}=1,$$

or equivalently

$$\frac{1}{\mu_F}\mathbb{E}\left\{e^{-\underline{Y}(\tau(\mu_F))}R_c\left(a\,e^{-\underline{Y}(\tau(\mu_F))}\right)\right\}\frac{\beta_+}{1+\beta_+}=1.$$

That is, a is the unique solution of

$$\mathbb{E}\left\{e^{-\underline{Y}(\tau(\mu_F))}R_c\left(a\,e^{-\underline{Y}(\tau(\mu_F))}\right)\right\}=\frac{\mu_F(1+\beta_+)}{\beta_+}. \tag{6.10}$$

A The Variational Approach in the Case of Time-Dependent Coefficients

In this Appendix we recall the solution of problem (2.7) obtained in Chiarolla and Haussmann [7] by a variational approach and we generalize some of their results to the case of deterministic, time-dependent coefficients of the controlled diffusion (cf. Assumption 5.1).

Let $C^{s,y,\nu}(t)$ be the capacity process starting at time $s\in[0,T)$ from y, controlled by ν, then

$$\begin{cases} dC^{s,y,\nu}(t)=C^{s,y,\nu}(t)[-\mu_C(t)dt+\sigma_C(t)dW(t)]+f_C(t)d\nu(t), \quad t\in[s,T), \\ \\ C^{s,y,\nu}(s)=y>0, \end{cases} \tag{A-1}$$

hence

$$C^{s,y,\nu}(t)=\frac{C^0(t)}{C^0(s)}\left\{y+\int_{[s,t)}\frac{C^0(s)}{C^0(u)}f_C(u)d\nu(u)\right\}$$

with $C^0(t)$ as defined in (2.3).

To semplify notation write

$$\widetilde{C}^s(t):=C^{s,1,0}(t)=\frac{C^0(t)}{C^0(s)}=e^{-\int_s^t(\mu_C(u)+\frac{1}{2}\sigma_C^2(u))du+\int_s^t\sigma_C(u)dW(u)}, \tag{A-2}$$

this process is $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_{s,t}:=\sigma\{W(u)-W(s), s\le u\le t\}$-measurable.

To $C^{s,y,\nu}$ we associate the expected total profit net of investment given by

$$J_{s,y}(\nu)=\mathbb{E}\left\{\int_s^T e^{-\int_s^t\mu_F(u)du}\,R(C^{s,y,\nu}(t))dt-\int_{[s,T)}e^{-\int_s^t\mu_F(u)du}d\nu(t)\right\}. \tag{A-3}$$

The corresponding optimal investment problem is

$$V(s,y):=\sup_{\nu\in\mathcal{S}_s}J_{s,y}(\nu), \tag{A-4}$$

where

$$\mathcal{S}_s \;:=\; \{\nu:\Omega\times[s,T]\to\mathbb{R}_+,\ \text{nondecreasing, left-continuous, adapted s.t. } \nu(s)=0,\ \mathbb{P}-\text{a.s.}\}$$

is the convex set of irreversible investments.

We define the opportunity cost of not investing until time t as (compare with [7], Section 3)

$$\zeta^{s,y,T}(t) := \int_s^t e^{-\int_s^u \mu_F(r)dr}\,\widetilde{C}^s(u)R_c(y\widetilde{C}^s(u))du + e^{-\int_s^t \mu_F(r)dr}\widetilde{C}^s(t)\frac{1}{f_C(t)}\mathbb{1}_{\{t<T\}}, \tag{A-5}$$

and the optimal stopping problem (compare with [7], (3.1))

$$Z^{s,y,T}(t) := \operatorname*{ess\,inf}_{t\le\tau\le T} \mathbb{E}\left\{\zeta^{s,y,T}(\tau)\big|\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_{s,t}\right\}. \tag{A-6}$$

Denoting by $\mathcal{Z}^{s,y,T}(\cdot)$ the right-continuous with left-limits modification of $Z^{s,y,T}(\cdot)$, for $s=t$ we set $v(s,y) := \mathcal{Z}^{s,y,T}(s)$, so that up to a null set,

$$\begin{aligned} v(s,y) \;&=\; \operatorname*{ess\,inf}_{s\le\tau\le T}\mathbb{E}\bigg\{\int_s^\tau e^{-\int_s^u \mu_F(r)dr}\,\widetilde{C}^s(u)R_c\left(y\widetilde{C}^s(u)\right)du \\ &\qquad + e^{-\int_s^\tau \mu_F(r)dr}\widetilde{C}^s(\tau)\frac{1}{f_C(\tau)}\mathbb{1}_{\{\tau<T\}}\bigg\}. \end{aligned} \tag{A-7}$$

Now, the results in [1], Proposition 2 and Theorem 3, guarantee that for $s\in[0,T)$ the stopping time

$$\tau^*(s,y) = \inf\left\{t\in[s,T) : \mathcal{Z}^{s,y,T}(t) = \zeta^{s,y,T}(t)\right\}\wedge T \tag{A-8}$$

is optimal for (A-6) and the function $v(s,y)$ is the shadow value of installed capital, i.e.

$$v(s,y) = \frac{\partial}{\partial y}V(s,y).$$

Theorem A.1. *Under Assumption 5.1, for every (s,y) in $[0,T)\times(0,\infty)$ the optimal stopping time (A-8) may be written as*

$$\tau^*(s,y) = \inf\left\{t\in[s,T) : v(t,Y^{s,y}(t)) = \frac{1}{f_C(t)}\right\}\wedge T. \tag{A-9}$$

Proof. Recall that $Y^{s,y}(t) := y\widetilde{C}^s(t)$. From (A-6) we may write

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Z}^{s,y,T}(t) \;&=\; \operatorname*{ess\,inf}_{t\le\tau\le T}\mathbb{E}\bigg\{\int_s^t e^{-\int_s^u \mu_F(r)dr}\,\widetilde{C}^s(u)R_c\left(Y^{s,y}(u)\right)du \\ &\qquad + \int_t^\tau e^{-\int_s^u \mu_F(r)dr}\,\widetilde{C}^s(u)R_c\left(Y^{s,y}(u)\right)du \\ &\qquad + e^{-\int_s^t \mu_F(r)dr}e^{-\int_t^\tau \mu_F(r)dr}\widetilde{C}^s(\tau)\frac{1}{f_C(\tau)}\mathbb{1}_{\{\tau<T\}}\Big|\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_{s,t}\bigg\} \qquad \text{(A-10)} \\ &=\; \zeta^{s,y,T}(t) + \operatorname*{ess\,inf}_{t\le\tau\le T}\mathbb{E}\bigg\{\int_t^\tau e^{-\int_s^u \mu_F(r)dr}\,\widetilde{C}^s(u)R_c\left(Y^{s,y}(u)\right)du \\ &\qquad + e^{-\int_s^t \mu_F(r)dr}\left(e^{-\int_t^\tau \mu_F(r)dr}\widetilde{C}^s(\tau)\frac{1}{f_C(\tau)}\mathbb{1}_{\{\tau<T\}} - \widetilde{C}^s(t)\frac{1}{f_C(t)}\mathbb{1}_{\{t<T\}}\right)\Big|\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_{s,t}\bigg\}. \end{aligned}$$

Notice that

$$\widetilde{C}^s(u) = \widetilde{C}^s(t)\widetilde{C}^t(u),\ \ \forall u\ge t, \quad \text{and} \quad e^{-\int_s^\tau \mu_F(r)dr}\widetilde{C}^s(\tau) = e^{-\int_s^t \mu_F(r)dr}e^{-\int_t^\tau \mu_F(r)dr}\widetilde{C}^s(t)\widetilde{C}^t(\tau).$$

Hence for $t < T$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{Z}^{s,y,T}(t) \;=\;& \zeta^{s,y,T}(t) \qquad\qquad (\text{A-11})\\ &+e^{-\int_s^t \mu_F(r)dr}\widetilde{C}^s(t)\operatorname*{ess\,inf}_{t\leq\tau\leq T}\mathbb{E}\bigg\{\int_t^\tau e^{-\int_t^u \mu_F(r)dr}\,\widetilde{C}^t(u)R_c\left(Y^{s,y}(t)\widetilde{C}^t(u)\right)du\\ &\qquad +e^{-\int_t^\tau \mu_F(r)dr}\widetilde{C}^s(\tau)\frac{1}{f_C(\tau)}\mathbb{1}_{\{\tau<T\}}-\frac{1}{f_C(t)}\bigg|\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_{s,t}\bigg\}.\end{aligned}$$

In order to take care of the conditioning in (A-11) we proceed exactly as in the proof of Proposition 5.2 by working on the canonical probability space $\left(\overline{\Omega},\overline{\mathbb{P}}\right)$, where $\overline{\mathbb{P}}$ is the Wiener measure on $\overline{\Omega} := \mathcal{C}_0\left([0,T]\right)$, the space of continuous functions on $[0,T]$ which are zero at time zero. Since $\widetilde{C}^t(\cdot)$ is independent of $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_{s,t}$ and $Y^{s,y}(t)$ is $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_{s,t}$-adapted, recalling (A-7), from (A-11) we get

$$\mathcal{Z}^{s,y,T}(t) = \zeta^{s,y,T}(t) + e^{-\int_s^t \mu_F(r)dr}\widetilde{C}^s(t)\Big(v\left(t,Y^{s,y}(t)\right)-\frac{1}{f_C(t)}\Big). \qquad (\text{A-12})$$

Finally, (A-8) and (A-12) imply

$$\begin{aligned}\tau^*(s,y) &= \inf\{t\in[s,T):\mathcal{Z}^{s,y,T}(t)=\zeta^{s,y,T}(t)\}\wedge T\\ &= \inf\left\{t\in[s,T):e^{-\int_s^t \mu_F(r)dr}\widetilde{C}^s(t)\Big(v\left(t,Y^{s,y}(t)\right)-\frac{1}{f_C(t)}\Big)=0\right\}\wedge T\\ &= \inf\left\{t\in[s,T):v(t,Y^{s,y}(t))=\frac{1}{f_C(t)}\right\}\wedge T. \qquad (\text{A-13})\end{aligned}$$

□

Notice that if $\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}_s\{\cdot\}$ is the expectation w.r.t. $\widetilde{\mathbb{P}}_s$ (cf. (5.4) for its definition), then (A-7) may also be written as

$$v(s,y) = \inf_{s\leq\tau\leq T}\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}_s\bigg\{\int_s^\tau e^{-\int_s^u \overline{\mu}(r)dr}\,R_c\left(Y^{s,y}(t)\right)du + e^{-\int_s^\tau \overline{\mu}(r)dr}\frac{1}{f_C(\tau)}\mathbb{1}_{\{\tau<T\}}\bigg\} \qquad (\text{A-14})$$

with $\overline{\mu}(t) = \mu_F(t) + \mu_C(t)$, for $t\in[0,T]$.

The value function $v(s,y)$ is expected to be the solution of a variational inequality similar to that obtained in Chiarolla and Haussmann [7] under Markovian restrictions (cf. [7], Assumption-[M]) and with a Cobb-Douglas production function (cf. [7], (4.5) and Theorem 4.4).

References

[1] F.M. Baldursson, I. Karatzas, *Irreversible Investment and Industry Equilibrium*, Finance and Stochastics 1 (1997), pp. 69 – 89.

[2] P. Bank, F. Riedel, *Optimal Consumption Choice with Intertemporal Substitution*, The Annals of Applied Probability 11 (2001), pp. 750 – 788.

[3] P. Bank, N. El Karoui, *A Stochastic Representation Theorem with Applications to Optimization and Obstacle Problems*, The Annals of Probability 32 (2004), pp. 1030 – 1067.

[4] P. Bank, *Optimal Control under a Dynamic Fuel Constraint*, SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization 44 (2005), pp. 1529 – 1541.

[5] J. Bertoin, *Levy Processes*, Cambridge University Press 1996.

[6] M.B. Chiarolla, U.G. Haussmann, *Explicit Solution of a Stochastic, Irreversible Investment Problem and its Moving Threshold*, Mathematics of Operations Research 30 No. 1 (2005), pp. 91 – 108.

[7] M.B. Chiarolla, U.G. Haussmann, *On a Stochastic Irreversible Investment Problem*, SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization 48 (2009), pp. 438 – 462.

[8] M.B. Chiarolla, G. Ferrari, F. Riedel, *Generalized Kuhn-Tucker Conditions for Stochastic Irreversible Investments with Limited Resources*, working paper (2011).

[9] N. El-Karoui, I. Karatzas, *Dynamic Allocation Problems in Continuous Time*, The Annals of Applied Probability 4 (1994), pp. 255 – 286.

[10] G. Ferrari, *On Stochastic Irreversible Investment Problems in Continuous Time: a New Approach based on First Order Conditions*, Ph.D. dissertation, University of Rome 'La Sapienza', 2011.

[11] J. Jacod, *Calcul Stochastique et Problèmes de Martingales*, no. 714 in Lecture Notes in Mathematics, Springer 1979.

[12] S. Jacka, *Optimal Stopping and the American Put*, Mathematical Finance 1 (1991), pp. 1 – 14.

[13] I. Karatzas, *The Monotone Follower Problem in Stochastic Decision Theory*, Applied Mathematics and Optimization 7 (1981), pp. 175 – 189.

[14] I. Karatzas, S.E. Shreve, *Connections between Optimal Stopping and Singular Stochastic Control I. Monotone Follower Problems*, SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization 22 (1984), pp. 856 – 877.

[15] I. Karatzas, S.E. Shreve, *Brownian Motion and Stochastic Calculus*, Springer-Verlag, New York 1988.

[16] H. Pham, *Explicit Solution to an Irreversible Investment Model with a Stochastic Production Capacity*, in 'From Stochastic Analysis to Mathematical Finance, Festschrift for Albert Shiryaev' (Y. Kabanov and R. Liptser eds.), Springer 2006.

[17] F. Riedel, X. Su, *On Irreversible Investment*, Finance and Stochastics 14 (2010).